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REJOINER

Reviewer 1: CN Mhutchu

General
The manuscript has been amended with a clear statement that this is the first phase in a larger project.

Minor
- Western Australia has been written in full.
- Aim: The aim has been amended to reflect the place that this food audit plays with the project.
- The method of distribution of the food audit surveys has been included in detail in the methods.
- Intro Para 3, line 5 – Apologies – should read culturally and linguistically diverse e.g. CALD
- Intro – final para, line 3 – spelling corrected
- Methods – para 1 line 1 – The process of development of the survey has been outlined and a statement has been included within the manuscript inviting those interested to contact the PI for a copy of the survey.
- Methods – para 1 line 1 - Distribution of the food audit surveys has been included in detail.
- Methods – para 1 para 1 – All food outlets in the chosen area were included – clarified in text.
- Methods - para 1 – GIS – I have included a short paragraph plus a diagram showing an example of how and why the GIS system was used. This should suffice as further explanation would be cumbersome and not add anything to the manuscript.
- Results – para 1 line 1 – The type of outlets has been described.
- Results – Table 1 – As all the outlets were local to the area and similar in function and had no significant differences therefore we do not believe it would add to the results to provide a cumbersome table by outlet type.
- Results – para 6 – the most popular foods were chosen by the respondent based on sales. – Included
• Results – para 6 – Soft drinks has been changed to carbonated drinks.
• Discussion – para 1 - pilot has been deleted – apologies for error.
• Discussion para 1 last sentence – Amended as suggested.
• Discussion para 3, 2nd sentence – The next phase of the project will involve a community survey. This has been noted within the text.

Reviewer2 : Jennifer Utter

General
Whilst we agree that several of the references are Australia-based, however the issue has significant international focus in many of the references included to support the literature presented. Having said this, the changes made to the manuscript based on the thoughtful comment of the reviewers have enhanced the text and, we believe, made the article much more accessible to other working in this area.

1. The concern with providing more information about the region is that it could then be identified. The most important issue of interest was the income level given the evidence supporting the strong link between income and food security. As this is the first phase in a much larger project, we will be able to provide more detailed information about the community as it will include substantially more respondent (e.g. representative of the entire district)
2. This has been answered in the response to Reviewer 1. There was no significant difference between the types of outlets who did not respond and those who did. – included in text.
3. The methodology has now been explained in greater detail within the text.
4. rather than include the instrument which would make the article quite long, the option has been provided to allow readers to access a copy of the audit instrument from the PI.
5. Results – para 1 – Thank you for this comment. Rather than add another table, we have instead added a figure showing an example of the GIS mapping system and how it was used in the study.
6. Pre-prepared has been explained in text.
7. The conclusions have been altered to note that this is the first phase of a larger study with the direction of the next phase is included. This is more realistic (see Reviewer 1’s comments).

Minor
1. Abstract – aim has been altered as suggested
2. Re: the definitions of food security and food insecurity are included. As noted, food security relates more to this study, however, we felt it was important to highlight both.
3. Intro para 5 The grammar has been corrected.
4. A paragraph has been included to highlight the role of GIS in this study (see comments in Reviewer 1).
5. Percentages have not been included in the tables as all add to 99. This is noted in the first paragraph of the results.